



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

That the situation in the flax industry of Belgium is growing more critical, and that due to the falling tendency in prices the cessation of orders has led to the closing of the greater part of the flax works.

That a delegation of Russian Bolshevik leaders who had originally intended to visit England, but were refused admission, have arrived in Germany ostensibly to study the trade-union organization in that country.

That a Pan-American College of Commerce is to open at Panama next January, to which the government of the Republic of Panama is giving earnest support, it being designated as the "Plattsburg" for American commerce.

That the exchange of university students between Belgium and the United States has recently become effective, with the admission of twenty-four Belgian students to American universities and of twenty-two Americans to Belgian universities.

That in order to meet the great shortage of food in Jamaica, which is the result of the increased cultivation of sugar-cane and of emigration, it has been decided to compel land-owners to utilize a certain portion of their properties in food cultivation.

That, according to Dr. Rosa, of the United States Bureau of Standards, 93 cents out of every dollar of Uncle Sam's money this year goes for war—past, present, or to come—and that one cent goes for education and the improvement of the public health.

That as a result of the continued high price of wheat flour, the Netherlands Government is arranging for a mixture of potato flour manufactured in that country, with wheat flour of the United States, to augment and cheapen the home supply of breadstuffs.

That leading commercial interests in Great Britain are planning to hold an exhibition some time in 1923 that will outdo any exposition ever held in Europe, its object to be to demonstrate the natural resources and the inventive and manufacturing possibilities of the Empire.

That after much discussion the wording of the inscription to be carved on the Arch of Triumph at Paris, celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Republic, is to be "*4 Septembre, 1870, Proclamation de la République. 11 Novembre, 1918, Restitution de l'Alsace-Lorraine à la France.*"

That M. Poincaré, former President of France, has written a letter to Professor Lavellée, saying that since for fifteen years at least France is to have an army on the left bank of the Rhine; that since she is to have an enormous task to perform in the Saar Basin, and since she is to undertake business enterprise with Germany, the study of the German language in the French schools should not be neglected.

THE LEAGUE AND AMERICAN POLITICS

President Wilson's Appeals—Candidate Harding's Statement—The People Ballot

On October 3 the President issued the following appeal to the people:

"MY FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN:

"The issues of the present campaign are of such tremendous importance and of such far-reaching significance for the influence of the country and the development of its future relations and I have necessarily had so much to do with their development that I am sure you will think it natural and proper that I should address to you a few words concerning them. Every one who sincerely believes in government by the people must rejoice at the turn affairs have taken in regard to this campaign. This election is to be a genuine national referendum. The determination of a great policy upon which the influence and authority of the United States in the world must depend is not to be left to groups of politicians of either party, but is to be referred to the people themselves for a sovereign mandate to their representatives. They are to instruct their own government what they wish done.

"The chief question that is put to you is, of course, this:

"Do you want your country's honor vindicated and the Treaty of Versailles ratified? Do you in particular approve of the League of Nations as organized and empowered in that treaty, and do you wish to see the United States play its responsible part in it? You have been grossly misled with regard to the treaty, and particularly with regard to the proposed character of the League of Nations, by those who have assumed the serious responsibility of opposing it. They have gone so far that those who have spent their lives, as I have spent mine, in familiarizing themselves with the history and traditions and policies of the nation must stand amazed at the gross ignorance and impudent audacity which has led them to attempt to invent an 'Americanism' of their own, which has no foundation whatever in any of the authentic traditions of the government.

"Americanism as they conceive it reverses the whole process of the last few tragic years. It would substitute America for Prussia in the policy of isolation and defiant segregation. Their conception of the dignity of the nation and its interest is that we should stand apart and watch for opportunities to advance our own interests, involve ourselves in no responsibility for the maintenance of the right in the world, or for the continued vindication of any of the things for which we entered the war to fight. The conception of the great creators of the government was absolutely opposite to this. They thought of America as the light of the world, as created to lead the world in the assertion of the rights of peoples and the rights of free nations; as destined to set a responsible example to all the world of what free government is and can do for the maintenance of right standards, both national and international. This light the opponents of the League would quench. They would relegate the United States to a subordinate rôle in the affairs of the world.

"Why should we be afraid of responsibilities which we are qualified to sustain, and which the whole of our history has constituted a promise to the world we would sustain? This is the most momentous issue that has ever been presented to the people of the United States, and I do not doubt that the hope of the whole world will be verified by an absolute assertion by the voters of the country of the determination of the United States to live up to all the great expectations which they created by entering the war and enabling the other great nations of the world to bring it to a victorious conclusion, to the conclusion of Prussianism and everything that arises out of Prussianism. Surely we shall not fail to keep the promise sealed in the death and sacrifice of our incomparable soldiers, sailors, and marines who await our verdict beneath the sod of France.

"Those who do not care to tell you the truth about the League of Nations tell you that article 10 of the covenant of the League would make it possible for other nations to lead us into war, whether we willed it by our own independent judgment or not. This is absolutely false. There is nothing in the covenant which in the least interferes with or impairs the right of Congress to declare war or not declare war, according to its own independent judgment, as our Constitution provides. Those who drew the covenant of the League were careful that it should contain nothing which interfered with or impaired the constitutional arrangements of any of the great nations which are to constitute its members. They would have been amazed and indignant at the things that are now being ignorantly said about this great and sincere document.

"The whole world will wait for your verdict in November as it would wait for an intimation of what its future is to be."

On October 27 the President read to a group of Pro-League Republicans the following statement of his convictions, his last contribution to the campaign. The delegation was headed by Hamilton Holt, of New York City, and included women as well as men. The President said:

"MY FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN:

"It is to be feared that the supreme issue presented for your consideration in the present campaign is growing more obscure rather than clearer by reason of the many arbitrary turns the discussion of it has taken. The editors and publishers of the country would render a great service if they would publish the full text of the Covenant of the League of Nations, because, having read that text, you would be able to judge for yourselves a great many things in which you are now in danger of being misled. I hope sincerely that it will be very widely and generally published entire. It is with a desire to reclarify the issue and to assist your judgment that I take the liberty of stating again the case submitted to you in as simple terms as possible.

"Three years ago it was my duty to summon you to the concert of war, to join the free nations of the world in meeting and ending the most sinister peril that had ever been developed in the irresponsible politics of the Old World. Your response to that call really settled the fortunes of war. You will remember that the morale of the German people broke down long before the strength of the German armies was broken. That was obviously because they felt that a great moral force which they could not look in the face had come into the contest, and that thenceforth all their professions of right were discredited, and they were unable to pretend that their continuation of the war was not the support of a government that had violated every principle of right and every consideration of humanity.

"It is my privilege to summon you now to the concert of peace and the completion of the great moral achievement on your part which the war represented and in the presence of which the world found a reassurance and a recovery of force which it could have experienced in no other way. We entered the war, as you remember, not merely to beat Germany, but to end the possibility of the renewal of such iniquitous schemes as Germany entertained. The war will have been fought in vain and our immense sacrifices thrown away unless we complete the work we then began, and I ask you to consider that there is only one way to assure the world of peace; that is by making it so dangerous to break the peace that no other nation will have the audacity to attempt it. We should not be deceived into supposing that imperialistic schemes ended with the defeat of Germany, or that Germany is the only nation that entertains such schemes or was moved by sinister ambitions and long-standing jealousies to attack the very structure of civilization. There are other nations which are likely to be powerfully moved or are already moved by commercial jealousy, by the desire to dominate and to have their own way in politics and in enterprise, and it is necessary to check them and to apprise them that the world will be united against them as it was against Germany if they attempt any similar thing.

"The mothers and sisters and wives of the country know

the sacrifice of war. They will feel that we have misled them and compelled them to make an entirely unnecessary sacrifice of their beloved ones if we do not make it as certain as it can be made that no similar sacrifice will be demanded of mothers and sisters and wives in the future. This duty is so plain that it seems to me to constitute a primary demand upon the conscience of every one of us. It is inconceivable to most of us that any men should have been so false or so heartless as to declare that the women of the country would again have to suffer the intolerable burden and privation of war if the League of Nations were adopted.

"The League of Nations is the well-considered effort of the whole group of nations who were opposed to Germany to secure themselves and the rest of mankind against a repetition of the war. It will have back of it the watchfulness and material force of all these nations, and is such a guarantee of a peaceful future as no well-informed man can question who does not doubt the whole spirit with which the war was conducted against Germany. The great moral influence of the United States will be absolutely thrown away if we do not complete the task which our soldiers and sailors so heroically undertook to execute.

"One thing ought to be said, and said very clearly, about Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations. It is the specific pledge of the members of the League that they will unite to resist exactly the things which Germany attempted, no matter who attempts them in the future. It is as exact a definition as could be given in general terms of the outrage which Germany would have committed if it could.

"Germany violated the territorial integrity of her neighbors and flouted their political independence in order to aggrandize herself, and almost every war of history has originated in such designs. It is significant that the nations of the world should have at last combined to define the general cause of war and to exercise such concert as may be necessary to prevent such methods. Article X, therefore, is the specific redemption of the pledge which the free governments of the world gave to their people when they entered the war. They promised their people not only that Germany would be prevented from carrying out her plot, but that the world would be safeguarded in the future from similar designs.

"We have now to choose whether we will make good or quit. We have joined issue, and the issue is between the spirit and purpose of the United States and the spirit and purpose of imperialism, no matter where it shows itself. The spirit of imperialism is absolutely opposed to free government, to the safe life of free nations, to the development of peaceful industry, and to the completion of the righteous processes of civilization. It seems to me, and I think it will seem to you, that it is our duty to show the indomitable will and irresistible majesty of the high purpose of the United States, so that the part we played in the war as soldiers and sailors may be crowned with the achievement of lasting peace.

"No one who opposes the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles and the adoption of the Covenant of the League of Nations has proposed any other adequate means of bringing about settled peace. There is no other available or possible means, and this means is ready to hand. They have, on the contrary, tried to persuade you that the very pledge contained in Article X, which is the essential pledge of the whole plan of security, is itself a threat of war. It is, on the contrary, an assurance of the concert of all the free peoples of the world in the future, as in the recent past, to see justice done and humanity protected and vindicated.

"This is the true, the real Americanism. This is the rôle of leadership and championship of the right which the leaders of the Republic intended that it should play. The so-called Americanism which we hear so much prating about now is spurious and invented for party purposes only.

"The choice is the supreme choice of the present campaign. It is regrettable that this choice should be associated with a party contest. As compared with the choice of a course of action that now underlies every other, the fate of parties is a matter of indifference. Parties are significant now in this contest only because the voters must make up

their minds which of the two parties is most likely to secure the indispensable result.

"The nation was never called upon to make a more solemn determination than it must now make. The whole future moral force of right in the world depends upon the United States rather than upon any other nation, and it would be pitiful indeed if, after so many great free people had entered the great League, we should hold aloof. I suggest that the candidacy of every candidate for whatever office be tested by this question, Shall we or shall we not redeem the great moral obligation of the United States?"

SENATOR HARDING'S FINAL STATEMENT TO VOTERS

In a formal statement issued from Marion, November 1, the Republican candidate said, referring to the League:

"There has been a steady attempt to deceive the people as to the issue of our foreign policy. There has been an attempt by the Democratic leaders to make the American people believe that the Republican policy is against America entering into a fraternity of nations to prevent war and to co-operate for peace. This is a deceit, and, of course, is an attempt to blind the people to the League of Nations issue as it was framed by the Democratic leaders and by the Democratic platform.

"The issue as presented by the Democratic administration and its representatives in this campaign is simply the question: 'Shall we enter the Paris League of Nations, assuming, among other obligations, the obligation of Article X?'

"The answer of the Democratic group is 'Yes.' The answer of the Republican Party and its candidate is 'No.'

"The reason for answering 'no' to the question drawn by our opponents is that America is not ready to mortgage her conscience to the Old World or engage to send her boys to war to carry on an old European controversy or place her resources at the beck and call of a group of shrewd diplomats acting for an armed alliance masked under the benevolent title of the League of Nations.

"America has already given her answer to the proposal to give up our nationality and our flag. That answer is 'no,' and 'no' is the answer of the Republican Party.

"My Democratic opponent, hearing that decisive 'no,' would like to change the issue. They have presented and make an issue on the question of what our party will do about a League of Nations.

"I have told them what I would do. I have told them I would do my best to unite America behind a plan for an association of nations which we may join with safety, honor, and good conscience, but without selling our birthright for a mess of military pottage. I have said from first to last in this campaign that I would consult the Senate and consult the people, because I am deeply impressed with the utter failure and waste of an executive policy of fabricating a League of Nations first and consulting America afterward.

"I want to consult America first, and take a course which will unite America and make it possible to join a world fraternity of nations, rather than a course which will divide America and make it impossible for us to do anything. A Democratic victory means a continued deadlock with the Senate, which has been so fruitless and will be fruitless forever.

"Our opponents have asked the American people to approve their draft of a league. The American people have said 'No.' This means that the man who is elected President must set his face toward a constructive plan. I have pointed the way."

THE BALLOTING OF THE PEOPLE

On November 2 the largest number of persons ever voting in the United States at a given time, and probably the largest number ever using the franchise in any land at any stage of its history, went to the polls. In number, it is estimated, they aggregated not less than 23,000,000 political units. Women in all States voted under authority conferred by the Nineteenth Amendment, and they used their

privilege and new right to such an extent that the vote in some States was increased more than 50 per cent.

The Electoral College

The verdict by the voters, registered in terms of the Electoral College, was as indicated in the appended table. The majority of 277 votes for Senator Harding, of Ohio, and Governor Coolidge, of Massachusetts, has only been exceeded once in presidential contests, and that was when President Wilson defeated Roosevelt and Taft in the election of 1912. Expressed in terms of the pluralities for the Republican candidates in States carried by them, the figures approximate 6,971,861 as over against the Cox pluralities of 969,000 in the eleven Democratic States. In this respect the outcome has been unprecedented, indicating a "landslide" that brought Tennessee out of the "Solid South" and gave the remainder of the country, geographically considered, to the victors. Following is the table:

State.	Harding.	Cox.
Alabama	..	12
Arizona	3	..
Arkansas	..	9
California	13	..
Colorado	6	..
Connecticut	7	..
Delaware	3	..
Florida	..	6
Georgia	..	14
Idaho	4	..
Illinois	29	..
Indiana	15	..
Iowa	13	..
Kansas	10	..
Kentucky	..	13
Louisiana	..	10
Maine	6	..
Maryland	8	..
Massachusetts	18	..
Michigan	15	..
Minnesota	12	..
Mississippi	..	10
Missouri	18	..
Montana	4	..
Nebraska	8	..
Nevada	3	..
New Hampshire	4	..
New Jersey	14	..
New Mexico	3	..
New York	45	..
North Carolina	..	12
North Dakota	5	..
Ohio	24	..
Oklahoma	10	..
Oregon	5	..
Pennsylvania	38	..
Rhode Island	5	..
South Carolina	..	9
South Dakota	5	..
Tennessee	12	..
Texas	..	20
Utah	4	..
Vermont	4	..
Virginia	..	12
Washington	7	..
West Virginia	8	..
Wisconsin	13	..
Wyoming	3	..
Total.....	404	127

Changes in Congress

With popular elections of Senators it became both possible and natural for verdicts on legislators and executives

registered simultaneously to become responsive to the same mass-movements and popular trends. Consequently the composition of the Senate of the Congress opening in March, 1921, will be much more strongly Republican than in the one that assembles in December. In the latter body the Republican margin is two, including the vote of Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin. In the next Senate the outlook now is for a majority of at least 22. Analyzed, the figures read thus:

	Dem.	Rep.	Total.
Holdover until 1923.....	16	16	32
Holdover until 1925.....	12	18	30
Elected November 2.....	9	25	34
Total.....	37	59	96

In thirty-four senatorial contests the Republicans captured ten seats now held by Democrats and retained all seats now held by Republicans.

In the House the change wrought has been much the same:

Republicans	296
Democrats	135
Independents	2
Independent and Prohibitionist.....	1
Socialist	1
Total.....	435

Republican majority, 157.

INTERPRETATION OF THE ELECTION RESULTS

Beginning with the night of the election and extending for many a day, there came interpretations of the meaning of the unusual political landslide. In the quotations which we have made from speeches, interviews, and editorials, we have cited, so far as possible, only such references as have to do with the League and its future, though in some cases the partisan note is not exempt from the comment quoted and had to be included in order to get the desired point of view registered:

The President-elect Defines His Attitude

In his first speech as President-elect, Senator Harding, speaking to his townsmen and to citizens from neighboring communities, at a jubilation carnival in Marion on the night of November 4, said:

"These are serious times. The civilization of the world was turned into a fluid state. Permanent crystallization has not yet come. It is for America to give to the world a steadying and stabilizing influence. I am going into office knowing that the heart of America is right. In the spirit of compromise, in the desire for understanding, and in the mutuality of interest, America will go on and give of her service to the good of humanity and the safety of the world. I want a part in that.

"I do not see as much sorrow in your faces as I had apprehended. It's not that you or I question the desire of America to play its part; it's not that we question the high ideals of those who were responsible for the Versailles Covenant. You just didn't want a surrender of the United States of America; you wanted America to go on under American ideals. That's why you didn't care for the League which is now deceased.

"America is playing a great part now. America is healing the heart of the Old World tonight, as no other nation; but there is more to do. There is a new world relationship, and when the next Administration comes into power, we're going to play our part. We're going to ask for nations associated

together in justice, but it shall be an association which surrenders nothing of American freedom."

Roosevelt and Coolidge Comment Prophetically

Vice-President-elect Coolidge, responding to congratulations, issued a statement November 3, interpreting the verdict. He said, in the course of this prophecy:

"It means the end of all ambiguous and visionary schemes and a beginning of recognition of the real and true world relationship—whether based on the proposed League or some new agreement is immaterial—and development of law. These are the sole avenues to abiding peace."

The defeated candidate for the Vice-Presidency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the same day, said:

"The result of the election in no way changes the duty of this country to join other nations in the splendid effort to solve international differences, to end militarism, and to avoid future wars."

Mr. William Jennings Bryan

Mr. Bryan, in an interview granted to the *Baltimore Sun*, said:

"Instead of recognizing that the constitutional provision requiring a two-thirds majority for ratification [of the treaty] compelled compromise, he [the President] insisted upon dictating the terms upon which ratification could be had, and then, on the 19th of March, stubbornly rejected ratification with reservations, even when Senator Harding and some 35 other Republicans were willing to accept the League as he wrote it with the few changes upon which they insisted. By thus preventing ratification, the President assumed responsibility for the nation's failure to enter the League, and thrust the League into the campaign as a partisan issue. The people, confronted with the choice between presidential infallibility and respect for the majority of the Senate, naturally chose the latter, and the Democratic Party, by endorsing the President's position, invited the defeat it deserved. . . . The American people want the government to play its part in the abolition of war, but they are indifferent as to whether we are part of a league or part of an association of nations. There is nothing to a name, but everything in a sentiment. The real issue presented by the Democratic Party was not whether we should co-operate with other nations interested in peace, but whether we should assume a moral obligation which had no weight, except as it suspended the right of Congress to act independently when the time arrived for action. The nation will do its part in aiding to prevent war, but it will not surrender into the keeping of any foreign group the right to determine when we shall declare war."

Senator Borah Opposes Any League

Senator Borah, who is opposed to any form of political alliance with foreign nations and who has steadfastly adhered to this position from the opening of the discussion, in and out of the Senate, said:

"The overwhelming and engulfing vote for the Republican ticket was the judgment of the American people against this League or any political alliance or combination with European powers. The League was the issue. The last three weeks heard nothing else. The audience would listen to nothing else. The President clearly and courageously presented the League proposition in his last interview to the public. Mr. Cox made his final appeal for the League. The great Democratic papers told the people over and over again that a vote for the Republican ticket was a vote for absolute rejection of the League.

"The Ellots and the Fishers and the Parsons packed their trunks and departed and told why they had to leave the party, because it was against the League. Harding in his speeches, particularly at Des Moines, and in his speech at Akron, at the very close of the campaign, accepted the

issue. Republican speakers almost universally accepted it. "The people rendered judgment. It was the triumph of nationalism. It was not a victory of the Republican Party, but the American people, because hundreds of thousands of Democrats voted the Republican ticket. It was an absolute rejection of all political alliances of leagues with foreign powers. It is a rededication of the nation to the foreign policy of George Washington and James Monroe, undiluted and unmeasured. The Republican Party, in my opinion, will accept the judgment as rendered and religiously live up to it."

Senator Johnson's Interpretation

Senator Hiram W. Johnson, of California, interviewed in San Francisco November 3, said:

"No amount of sophistry or pretense can obscure the issue in yesterday's election. Men and women who bear the burden and pay the price of war finally have had the opportunity to pass upon the foreign policy of their country. On the one hand was the internationalism of the League of Nations, and on the other the American policy of Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe.

"The menacing, dangerous, and entangling League has been emphatically and overwhelmingly repudiated. Sons and daughters of America have determined America shall remain the nation we have known, continuing steadfastly in the old path that led to our present greatness and glory.

"It's the end of the League of Nations; it's the recrudescence of Americanism. The victory of Senator Harding is the response of the American spirit to the endeavor to denationalize it."

Senator Reed's Diagnosis

Senator Reed, of Missouri, a Democrat and unvarying opponent of the League, said:

"The American people refused to haul down the American flag. It was the tragic mistake of supporting the League issue that split the Democratic Party and resulted in a Republican victory."

Mr. Taft's Comments

Ex-President Taft, in an interview, November 3, said:

"The issue has been Article X, although efforts have been made to focus the League fight elsewhere. My view is that the American people disapprove of Article X unless adequately safeguarded. If it is inserted at all, it must be so qualified as to postpone its obligations as regards the United States until some specific case shall arise which calls for an American decision; and then, in the face of a concrete case, Congress, acting under its war power, shall determine the country's course. This would be a colorless provision, and it is probably preferable that Article X be eliminated entirely, as far as the United States is concerned.

"Article X is President Wilson's provision, and neither England nor France have wanted it. With Harding elected, there should be little difficulty in agreeing on an association which will contain all the good things of the Covenant—disarmament, arbitration, mediation, and effective penalties for going to war before arbitration has been thoroughly tried.

"The Republican platform is clear, and Senator Harding has made himself clear, regarding our part in an association of nations, and I believe there is no chance of our holding aloof."

Ex-Attorney General Wickersham, a Republican champion of the League, says:

"I do not believe that the result of the election is that the Treaty of Versailles is scrapped. An agreement to which so many nations have given their assent cannot lightly be abandoned. But the countries dominant in the League will, of course, be reasonable, and the representatives of the United States under the new Administration will also, I believe, be reasonable, and a conclusion will be reached under which technical as well as actual peace will be realized

with honor, and the United States will discharge its moral obligations to the other nations of the world. I have firmly believed this would be the case, and for that reason I have consistently supported the Republican ticket throughout the campaign."

As Home Journalists See It

"It was they [the plain people] . . . who saw at a glance the misty shadow of super-government of Geneva."—*Boston Transcript*.

"Discontent with the Wilson Administration, racial opposition to the alleged effects of the League—these obviously were the prime causes of the avalanche which swept Senator Harding to victory."—*The Springfield Republican*.

"As we see it now, any man in the Presidency and any party in power would have met the same punishment that was meted out yesterday. . . . Any Administration that conducted the war would now be the target of the bewildering number of protests that merged yesterday into one gigantic protest."—*New York Evening Post*.

"The magnitude of the majority for Mr. Harding is sufficiently explained by this demonstration of interest in alien causes. It was foreseen, it was well understood, it was known, that it would bring millions of voters. The League of Nations' issue, the only one upon which the Democrats could have made any respectable showing, was altogether submerged by this tidal wave."—*The New York Times*.

"After 140 years of self-government, this country has not decided to take in half a hundred bankrupt partners to be managed by them.

"The United States has voted for government of this country by this country.

"The fourteen points are dead.

"The League of Nations, as regards this country, is dead.

"Europe has been notified that she must fight her own fights, if she cannot make up her mind to keep the peace."—*New York American*.

"The American people wanted a change, and they have voted for a change. They did not know what kind of a change they wanted, and they do not know today what kind of a change they voted for. All of the restlessness and discontent bred of the war has finally found expression at the ballot-box. . . . If Mr. Root and Mr. Taft and their friends gain the ascendancy, they will control the foreign policy. If Senator Borah and the Battalion of Death gain control, they will dominate the foreign policy. . . . Every reason that existed yesterday in favor of ratification of the covenant exists today. . . . Hundreds of thousands of the friends of the League voted for Mr. Harding in the belief that he and his associates had told them the truth. The record is made and the obligation must be redeemed or they, too, will have been convicted of defrauding both the living and the dead."—*New York World*.

Public Opinion Abroad

The various points of view of the press of Germany are indicated in the following quotations from the Berlin press:

"Mr. Harding will play politics and mix in world affairs only so far as they concern American interests."—*The Lokal-Anzeiger*.

"If today we shake hands in spirit with President-elect Harding across the sea, it is because we see in him a man who can quickly bring us peace with union, and who has the vision and desire for a better League of Nations."—*The Tageblatt*.

"That the United States should not sign the Versailles Treaty is far more important for us than she should enter the League of Nations. That will be better for our commercial relations. The Versailles hangmen must be made to recognize that Germany will regard those who signed the treaty of murder far differently from those who did not."—*The Kreuz-Zeitung*.

"To hope anything for Germany from this result would be foolish. The utmost we could expect is that instead of making life impossible, as Wilson did, his successor probably will not display a great interest in whether we can or cannot exist."—*The Zeitung am Mittag*.

British opinion is reflected in the following quotations:

"America intends to let the rest of the world sink or swim, as it may. The United States is tired of war, Europe, the Versailles Treaty, President Wilson, and all that President Wilson represents. All German and Irish enemies of England represented the League of Nations as an English dodge to entrap the United States. And so participation of the great Republic in the pacification of the world is greatly delayed."—*The Star (London)*.

"In electing Mr. Harding, the American people declared emphatically for a spell of conservatism in home politics and cautious Americanism in the world outlook. The defeat of Cox condemns the League of Nations as constructed at Versailles. But, while Mr. Harding discards the League, he and his party are aware that the United States must sooner or later take their part in settling the troubles of the Old World."—*The Daily Mail (London)*.

"It is well to bear in mind, however, that millions of Americans who believe that the United States should and will indorse the League of Nations, with certain reservations, voted for Harding yesterday.

"Faced not with an election to win, but with a world which is to be given over to war or bound over to keep the peace, the new President and the new Republican Administration will probably not fail in its duty to the paramount interests of civilization."—*The Star (Toronto)*.

"The main political motive for the electors' choice is, by general assent, accumulated dislike of Wilsonism and not love of Harding and his party. . . . The national repudiation marks a tragic change from those weeks in the autumn of 1913 when the material power of America was deciding the world war and her foremost mind was leading the world toward such a peace as might have given us a tranquil, swiftly convalescent world instead of the present world's fair of spites, greed, and suspicions between nations, and disunion inside each of them. The soiled, scarred old world of international politics seemed to be on the eve of redemption on the day when the news came that Germany would surrender on the basis of Wilson's fourteen points.

"In what proportion a want of dynamic genius in President Wilson and an irredeemable viciousness of spirit in other politicians contribute to darken that opening prospect we cannot tell yet. It is gone now. Europe is snarling, grabbing, and jockeying in the old slime, while all the remaining effect of Wilsonism in America is the decision of the presidential election by an overwhelming balance of public antipathy to it. The story is that of one of the most pitiful of all failures in the execution of a task nobly conceived."—*The Guardian (Manchester)*.

The French press generally interprets the decision as hostile to the League:

"The election may be considered as a referendum on the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations, the result of which is a personal defeat for President Wilson."—*La Temps*.

"American common sense has condemned Eutopia in all its forms. From an international standpoint, the day was a bad day for socialism and the society of nations, the consequence of which will be felt throughout the world."—*La Liberte*.

"Does the fact that America has abandoned the Wilsonian League of Nations mean that America has adopted an abstinence from the affairs of Europe? . . . We are not of that opinion. The United States can take part in the affairs of the old continent in two ways: they can aggravate and

complicate them with disordered dreams, with humanitarianism, with their Biblical reformation and their Bolshevism; that was the method of the government that succumbed yesterday; or they can help in settling, in concert with us, certain concrete problems."—*Pertinax*, in "*Echo de Paris*."

"It is a League of Nations which will work that we expect from you. That one which has been built is a heavy and unwieldy carcass, in which there are no characteristics—life, rapidity, and fairness. Change it and put into it the qualities of your race."—*Stephane Lauzanne*, in "*Le Matin*."

Significant opinions from the press of other nations interested follows:

"The first natural reaction against the autocratic tendencies and international tendencies of President Wilson."—*The Bund (Berne, Switzerland)*.

"President Wilson's exemption of the Monroe Doctrine reduced the League's proposed effectiveness 50 per cent, and if Mr. Harding insists on further reservations the League will be seriously imperiled."—*Jiji Shimpō (Tokyo, Japan)*.

"If Mr. Harding picks men like Elihu Root and William H. Taft, then we can expect the United States in the League of Nations soon. If he picks Senators Johnson and Borah, then the United States will be out of the League for a long time."—*The Vaderland (The Hague, Holland)*.

"Many people in the United States have believed that the various South American countries, members of the League, would withdraw in order to follow the policy inspired by the United States, and contrary, naturally, to the League. The declaration on the Monroe Doctrine Senator Harding made to the correspondent of *La Nacion* hardly seems an adequate cause for the South American members of the League to abandon it. In effect, Senator Harding told our correspondent that the Monroe Doctrine was not an international pact or agreement, but a declaration of policy by the United States which promised protection against abuses or aggression by European nations, precisely an interpretation which causes the greatest resistance from most, if not all, of these countries, and which is contrary to the interpretation President Wilson has given, according to which the doctrine established among the American nations a most perfect equality, an equality that cannot exist if the question of protection that is not asked is the product entirely of the one-sided resolution of a power declaring itself the protector against dangers in which no one believes."—*From La Nacion (Buenos Aires)*.

On November 5 the President-elect issued from his home in Marion the following statement:

President-elect Plans for Conference

"Senator Harding let it be known today he is sending out a number of requests for personal and very informal conferences with men and women who have been eminent in the discussion of our foreign relations. These conferences will take place upon his return to Marion in December, and will be individual and personal, with the main purpose of learning what policy may enlist united support.

"Senator Harding means to avoid any unseemly anticipation, but he feels it wholly becoming to get an expression entirely free from campaign bias, and to get it at the earliest possible day. It is the first step toward the meeting of minds of which Senator Harding so frequently spoke during the campaign. He did not make public any list because it will not be complete before his vacation ends."

THE HARDING-WILSON CORRESPONDENCE

One incident of the campaign which attracted some attention at home and abroad, and brought from the French Government a formal disclaimer, was the correspondence between the Republican candidate and President Wilson,

arising from reported comments of the former upon France's attitude toward the League.

The letter of the President to Senator Harding follows:

"EIGHTEENTH OF OCTOBER, 1920.

"MY DEAR SIR:

"In the *New York Times* of yesterday, Sunday, October 17, 1920, I find a dispatch dated St. Louis, October 16, which purports to report recent public utterances of yours. In it occurs the following:

"Replying to criticisms of his proposal for an association of nations, he said in a rear-platform speech at Greencastle, Ind., that he already had been approached informally by a representative of France, who asked that the United States lead the way to a world fraternity."

"I write to ask if this is a correct quotation and if you really said what is there accredited to you. I need not point out to you the grave and extraordinary inferences to be drawn from such a statement, namely, that the Government of France, which is a member of the League of Nations, approached private citizens of a nation, which is not a member of the League, with a request 'that the United States lead the way to a world fraternity.' The Department of State has always found the Government of France most honorably mindful of its international obligations and punctiliously careful to observe all the proprieties of international intercourse.

"I hesitate, therefore, to draw the inference to which I have referred unless I am assured by you that you actually made this statement.

"Very truly yours.

"WOODROW WILSON."

Senator Harding's Answer

The text of Senator Harding's letter sent in reply to one from the President, asking whether the Senator had been correctly quoted in his Greencastle speech, is as follows:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:

"I have before me a press copy of your letter to me of this date, though I am not in receipt of the original copy. I am glad to make a prompt reply.

"It is very gratifying that you hesitate to draw inferences without my assurance that I am correctly quoted. The quotation as reported in your letter is not exact. The notes of the stenographer reporting my remarks quote me as saying: 'France has sent her spokesmen to me informally, asking America in its new realization of the situation to lead the way for an association of nations.'

"I am sure that my words could not be construed to say that the French Government had sent anybody to me. The thought I was trying to convey was that there had come to me those who spoke a sentiment which they represented to be very manifest among the French people, but nothing could suggest the French Government having violated the proprieties of international relations. Official France would never seek to go over your high office as our chief executive to appeal to the American people or any portion thereof.

"I can see no impropriety in private citizens of France, or in Americans deeply friendly to France, expressing to me their understanding of sentiment in that friendly republic.

"It is not important enough to discuss, perhaps, but I very respectfully urge that an informal expression to me is rather more than that to a private citizen. I hold a place as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, which is charged with certain constitutional authority in dealing with foreign relations, and I am necessarily conscious that I am the nominee of the Republican Party for President of our Republic.

"In the combination of these positions it ought not to be unseemly that some very devoted friend of a new and better relationship among nations, no matter whence they come, should wish to advise me relating to aspirations to co-operate with our own Republic in attaining that high purpose. Let me assure you again of the observance of all the proprieties and again assert that the French Government has maintained that great respect for your position to which I myself subscribe.

"With great respect, I am very truly,

"WARREN G. HARDING."

JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

Following prolonged and intimate consultations relative to the proposed restrictive legislation of California, and on the eve of the vote by the people of that State on the amendments which Japan deems hostile in their intent, Under-Secretary of State Davis, of the Department of State, on November 1 issued the following statement:

"The movement in California to recast the State laws affecting alien land tenure has been receiving since its inception the close and interested attention of the Department of State. The relations of certain treaty provisions to the proposed measure is being discussed clearly and ably in California and will doubtless prove an element in the State's decision as to the adoption or rejection of the proposed measure.

"In the meantime the department has had numerous discussions of the most friendly and candid nature with the Ambassador of Japan, and it is believed he thoroughly realizes, as we have sought to make clear, that no outcome of the California movement will be acceptable to the country at large that does not accord with existing and applicable provisions of law, and, what is equally important, with the national instinct of justice."

On November 2 the voters in California, in a ratio of 2 to 1, approved the proposed restrictive laws governing aliens' rights to hold property. At this writing it seems likely that an appeal to the Federal Supreme Court will be taken on the issue of the constitutionality of the discriminating legislation. Meantime the Japanese Government is bringing pressure on the home press to lessen attacks on the United States; and negotiations between Tokyo and Washington are proceeding for a new treaty governing immigration.

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES' APPEAL

Having, through a special commission, made careful investigation of the conditions that have increased friction between the United States and Japan since 1914, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, through its Commission on Relations with the Orient, has put forth the following appeal:

Japan and California are both intensely aroused over the problems, discussions, and political programs connected with the presence of Japanese in California. This commission was established by the Federal Council in 1914, in order to examine the entire question of American relations with Asia and Asiatics from the standpoint of Christian principles, with a view to promoting a solution in accord with these principles. For six years it has been steadily dealing with this problem.

I. It is pertinent, therefore, for this commission to call upon all men of good will, both in America and Japan—

1. To refuse to be stampeded into precipitate action by the vote-catching propaganda politicians, who appeal to race prejudice and strive to arouse mob feeling.

2. To urge that all the facts be taken into consideration. Partisan statements of any group are to be discounted.

3. To await the results of the conference of their responsible representatives in Washington and Tokyo.

II. To Americans this commission would state:

1. While the local stress of the Japanese problem in California is not easily appreciated by States not similarly affected, we should all remember that the question has international aspects of the gravest import in which the whole nation has a right to be heard. California's legitimate ends can best be secured through Washington. We therefore urge California to work out its local problem in the closest co-operation with the Department of State. Any other method is bound, sooner or later, to involve our country in international complications.

2. Only the patient exercise of the principles of honor, justice, and fair play between nations and races can afford